

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 20 and 26-31 are pending in this application after this amendment. Claims 1 and 30 are independent. New claims 30 and 31 are presented for consideration by the Examiner. No new matter has been added by the addition of these new claims. In light of the remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 10 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (USP 5,953,481) in view of Steinberg (USP 5,862,217) and further in view of Sehr (USP 6,999,936); and rejected claims 20 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Steinberg and Sehr and further in view of Peters (USP 6,601,093). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In support of her rejection of claim 1, the Examiner now admits that Watanabe and Steinberg fail to teach or suggest the enciphering device as claimed. The Examiner relies on the teachings of Sehr to cure the deficiencies of Watanabe and Steinberg. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of these references.

1. The Cited References Fail To Teach or Suggest All of the Claim Elements

The disclosure of Sehr is directed to an electronic ticketing system and methods utilizing multi-service visitor cards. The ticketing system disclosed in Sehr includes a plurality of entities such as an event organizer, admission center, service providers and a visitor population so as to automatically compile, issue, utilize and process ticketing cards for the admission to sporting events and other leisure and entertainment activities. (Abstract).

At col. 28, lines 24-50, Sehr discloses as follows:

To better illustrate the above system and methods, let's use the visitor card as an electronic ticket to a sports stadium including related events, a payment carrier including a monetary value for the purchase of goods and services, as well as a host of rights and

considerations underwritten by the event organizer and service providers. Also, to guarantee a secure information exchange and to authenticate the card or system data, a cryptography scheme based, for example, upon the public key technology can be implemented; all entities including individuals involved in the exchange or authentication of scrambled data will have an unique pair of keys, a public key known to everybody and a secret private key known only to a particular entity. **The public key can include, for example, a unique mailing address or public telephone number**, and the private key a secret combination of alphanumeric characters or a biometrics characteristics of an individual. In this way, a sender can communicate secure messages to a receiver while encrypting the messages with the public key of that receiver prior to transmission. The transmitted message can be decrypted only by the corresponding private key of the receiver (e.g. addressee); only the addressee on the envelope can open the envelope and read the letter. Besides, any information encrypted with the private key of a sender can be decrypted only by the corresponding (e.g. sender's) public key; the letter signed via the private key is therefore authentic and was send by that sender. (Emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above disclosure, Sehr merely discloses utilizing public/private key encryption. The public key can include a unique mailing address or public telephone number.

However, claim 1 clearly requires an enciphering device that **enciphers, according to the identification information specifying the external apparatus**, at least one of the image data and the operating information. Sehr merely discloses the public key including a unique mailing address or public telephone number. There is no information in Sehr that is directed to enciphering device that enciphers, according to the identification information specifying the external apparatus, at least one of the image data and the operating information, as required by claim 1. As Sehr fails to teach or suggest this claim element, Applicants respectfully submit that Sehr fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Watanabe and Steinberg. As the Examiner has failed to provide references that teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicants respectfully request the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

2. The Examiner has Failed to Cite Analogous Art

The Examiner now relies on the teachings of Sehr to support her assertion that the claims are obvious. Sehr is directed to an electronic ticketing system and method utilizing multi-service visitor cards.

In contrast, the present application's field of endeavor is directed to an electronic camera with a function for converting an optical image into electric signals by a photo-electric transfer imaging device, and a remote-control operation system for controlling an external apparatus with the electronic camera. As such, Sehr is directed to a different field of endeavor.

Further, Sehr seeks to solve the problem of high cost, unproductive, and low quality electronic ticketing systems. In contrast, the present application seeks to solve a problem of impractical remote control of an electronic camera. As such, Sehr seeks to solve a different problem than the problem being solved in the present application. As such, Applicants maintain that Sehr is non-analogous art. Further, Applicants maintain that one skilled in the art would not look to the ticketing system of Sehr to modify the reproducing apparatus of Watanabe.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants maintain that claim 1 is patentable over the references as cited. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 20 and 26-29 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claim 30 includes elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus claim 30, together with claims dependent thereon, are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Catherine M. Voisinet

Registration No.: 52,327

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants